



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,897	05/20/1999	ANAND RAMAKRISHNA	1890	8450
7590	03/10/2005		EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/316,897	RAMAKRISHNA, ANAND	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhahan Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 12/13/2004 to the original application filed 06/22/1999.
2. Claims 1-47 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, and 30 have been amended. Claims 1, 17 and 30 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17 and 30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase “the behavior” (claim 17, line 3; claim 30, line 3) lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 17, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specification does not explicitly describe nor is sufficiently clear for one of ordinary skill in art to recognize the following steps as recited in claims 1, 17, and 30:

- a. the external component may be used **simultaneously** with a plurality of different documents; and
- b. an external component that may **simultaneously** effect the behavior of one or more elements.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27-39, and 43-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gudmundson et al.** (U.S. 5,907,704 – filed 10/1996).

As to independent claim 17:

- a. Gudmundson teaches a method of providing dynamic effects to an HTML document (e.g., *any element can link dynamically ... on the World Wide Web; col.11, lines 8-15*), comprising the steps of:
 - (i) encapsulating code in an external component (e.g., *Elements 'encapsulated' their child Elements by creating a modular interface through which an Element's child Elements can communicate with objects external Element container... the system automatically 'encapsulated' ... once encapsulated, they can be used in other 'environments' ... their elements and behaviors are thus selectively reusable; col.9, lines 1-39*) that may simultaneously affecting the behavior of one or more elements, including elements of different documents (e.g., *a single animation file can be linked simultaneously to multiple Elements. Each Element can use this animation without regard to the other Element; col.25, line 66-col.26, line 6*);
 - (ii) inserting an element into a document (e.g., *embed a title within a Word Wide Web page; col. 11, lines 8-16 / the first Element ... to be embedded in a first Web page; col.88, lines 21-22*); and
 - (iii) providing the document to a render (*col.11, lines 16-21*).
- b. While Gudmundson teaches the association of the element and the external component (e.g., *Elements generally can be linked to external media 'such as text,*

sounds, pictures, animations and movies'; col.8, lines 39-45), Gudmundson does not explicitly teach "attaching a reference in the document."

- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Gudmundson's teaching to include "*attaching a reference in the document*" because it would have allowed the element in the document to posses certain inherent characteristics relating to that external component.
- d. The fact that Gudmundson's teaching "*create reusable 'object container' merely by defining links among instantiated object*" (col.7, line 64-col.8, line 6) and purpose of using the attaching a reference in Gudmundson suggests that defined links in the document to associate the element with the external component.

As to dependent claim 18:

Gudmundson teaches providing the external component to the renderer (*col.11, lines 16-21*).

As to dependent claim 19:

Gudmundson teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and modifying a representation of the element based on the code in the external component (*col.22, lines 21-30 /col.39, lines 12-23*).

As to dependent claim 21:

Gudmundson teaches modifying a presentation of the element includes the changing the appearance thereof (*col.21, lines 21-30/ col.24, lines 56-63/col.45, lines 65-67/col.39, lines 12-23*).

As to dependent claim 22:

Gudmundson teaches modifying a presentation of the element includes the changing the location thereof (*col.21, lines 21-30/ col.24, lines 56-63/col.45, lines 65-67/col.39, lines 12-23*).

As to dependent claim 23:

Gudmundson teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and drawing information in the image based on the code in the external component (*col.23, lines 66-col.24, line 21*).

As to dependent claim 24:

Gudmundson teaches rendering a page image from the document is interleaved with drawing information in the image (*col.24, lines 1-21*).

As to dependent claim 25:

Gudmundson teaches receiving an event indicative of user interaction with the image (*col.43, lines 40-51*).

As to dependent claim 27:

Gudmundson teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a custom tag (*col.15, lines 44-65*).

As to dependent claim 28:

Gudmundson teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a class identifier (*col.14, lines 38-61*).

As to dependent claim 29:

Gudmundson teaches the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained inline with the element in the document (*col.15, lines 44-65*).

As to independent claim 1:

It is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, claim 17 further recites:

- a. rendering a page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the page image including a representation of the element (*e.g., create various types of Elements and to assign particular characteristic to each Element; col.13, lines 24-59*); and
- b. accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element rendered on the page image (*e.g., elements generally can be linked to the external media ... possess certain inherent characteristics relating to that media; col.8, lines 39-45/col.13, line 60-col.14, line 7*).

As to dependent claim 2:

Gudmundson teaches receiving an event, and wherein accessing the external component is performed in response to the event (*col.17, lines 51-60*).

As to dependent claims 3-5:

They include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 6:

Gudmundson teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein accessing the external component includes instantiating an instance of the object (*col. 7, line 65-col. 8, lines 6*).

As to dependent claim 7:

Gudmundson teaches receiving a new document having another element thereon, the new document including information associating the other element with the external component, rendering a new page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the new page image including a representation of the other element, and accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element rendered on the page image (*Fig. 1 and associated text*).

As to dependent claims 9-12:

They include the same limitations as in claims 26-29, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 13:

Gudmundson teaches the document includes another element having a representation thereof rendered in the page image, the document includes other information associating the other element with the external component, and further comprising, accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element (*col. 13, lines 24-37*).

As to dependent claim 14:

Gudmundson teaches the document includes information associating the element with a second external component, and further comprising, accessing the second external

component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element (*col.13, lines 24-37*).

As to dependent claim 15:

Gudmundson teaches resolving a conflict between the behavior determined by the external component and the behavior determined by the second external component (*col.18, lines 3-26*).

As to dependent claim 16:

Gudmundson teaches downloading the external component (*col.1, lines 8-15*).

As to independent claim 30:

- a. It is directed to a computer system for performing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, claim 30 further recites “modifying the behavior of elements.”
- b. Gudmundson teaches modifying the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents (*e.g., modify an object’s characteristics and reuse it in other environments; col.8, lines 20-54 / modify their elements so as to ‘inherit’ and ‘disinherit’ characteristics; col.9, lines 18-29*).

As to dependent claim 31:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 32:

Gudmundson teaches the renderer displays a representation of the element and modifies a behavior of the element by accessing the external component (*col.9, lines 18-28*).

As to dependent claims 33-35:

They include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 36:

Gudmundson teaches the renderer calls the external component a plurality of times to draw information on the page image, and the renderer draws information on the page image between at least some of calls to the external component (*col.16, lines 57-67*).

As to dependent claim 37:

Gudmundson teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein the rendered instantiates an instance of the object (*col.18, lines 3-26*).

As to dependent claim 38:

Gudmundson teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein the rendered communicates with the object (*col.18, lines 3-13*).

As to dependent claim 39:

Gudmundson teaches the render receives a new document having another element thereon that references the external component (*col.22, lines 21-30*).

As to dependent claim 40:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 43:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 27, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 44-46:

They include the same limitations as in claims 12-14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 47:

Gudmundson teaches the renderer accesses the external component to control the format of data input by a user (*col.14, lines 30-61*).

7. Claims 8 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gudmundson et al.** in view of **Courts et al.** (U.S. 6,085,220 – filed 09/1998).

As to dependent claim 20:

- a. Gudmundson does not explicitly teach “a COM object.”
- b. Courts teaches a COM object (*e.g., COM objects; fig. 1*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Courts in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the enhanced capability for customizing dynamic content in the generated HTML documents.

As to dependent claim 8:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 20, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 9, 26, and 40-42 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gudmundson et al.** in view of **Pacifci et al.** (U.S. 6,230,171 – filed 08/1998).

As to dependent claim 9:

- a. Gudmundson teaches associating the element with the external component (*col.8, lines 40-45/ col.14, lines 4-7*), but does not explicitly teach “the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet.”
- b. Pacifici teaches the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet (*col.9, line 55-col.19, line 7*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to dependent claim 26:

Refer to the discussion of claim 9 above for the external component is maintained in a cascading stylesheet.

As to dependent claim 40:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 41:

- a. Gudmundson does not explicitly teach “the cascading style sheet is embedded in the document.”
- b. Pacifici teaches the cascading style sheet is embedded in the document (*e.g., dynamic HTML ... using a Cascading Style Sheet; col.9, line 47-col.10, line 7*).

c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to dependent claim 42:

- a. Gudmundson does not explicitly teach "the cascading style sheet is linked to the document."
- b. Pacifici teaches the cascading style sheet is linked to the document (*col. 6, lines 1-29*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 12/13/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Gudmundson simply does not teach or even suggest the concept of an encapsulated elements having the ability to be simultaneous used by different elements in different documents.* (pages 18, 19, 21, and 23)

In response, the Examiner believes that the Gudmundson's teachings "a single animation file can be linked simultaneously to multiple Element. Each element can use this animation without regard to other Elements" (col.25, line 66-col.26, line 6) read-on the limitations as claimed by Applicant.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

EMMELMAN U.S. Publication 2003/0074634 A1 Pub. Date: Apr. 17, 2003

Broman U.S. Patent No. 6,751,778 issued: Jun. 15, 2004

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhahan Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhahan Nguyen
March 7, 2005



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER